


62-00136

STAT

21 SEP 1960



✓ card

Mr. Pierre Salinger
Press Assistant to Senator Kennedy
Room 362, Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.


Dear Mr. Salinger:

Reference is made to my letter of 2 September 1960 and the attachment thereto.

Mr. Dulles has asked that I forward to you for Senator Kennedy the third in the series of our memoranda covering world comment on the Republican and Democratic national tickets.


Sincerely,


SIGNED


Executive Officer

STAT


Attachment
Special Memo,
No. 3, 19 Sept 60

O/DCI/ vgd 21 Sep 60
Distribution:
orig & 1 - Addressee
1 - JSE w/o attach
1 - ER w/attach.

Attachment is  No. 3 - 19 September 1960
"World Comment on Republican and Democratic National Tickets"

EXECUTIVE

STAT



SPECIAL MEMORANDUM

WORLD COMMENT ON
REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL TICKETS

NO. 3 -- 19 SEPTEMBER 1960

STAT



T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

COMMUNIST BLOC COMMENT

USSR	1
Hungary	16

OTHER COUNTRIES

Arab States	18
Kenya	25
Cuba	25
Dominican Republic	26

U S S R

CANDIDATES' SPEECHES BELIEVE PEACE AIMS

Moscow, Soviet North American Service in English, Aug. 30, 1960,
0011 GMT--L

(Leonid Vavilov commentary)

(Text) U.S. politicians like to talk about the U.S. desire for peace. We should like to believe this desire. Unfortunately, events often occur and speeches are made that could dissuade the most unbiased. The recent Detroit convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is a good case in point. Prominent politicians and well-known military men spoke. Both presidential candidates, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon, took the floor. But they said little about peace and a lot about war. Again and again they mentioned the latest models of American ballistic rockets and strategic nuclear bombs.

Generals and politicians alike claimed that a faster arms race is needed to safeguard America against (nuclear?) attack from the Soviet Union. But in speaking of defense, (words were used?) which have little to do with defense but a great deal to do with aggression. For example, General (name indistinct) said that the main task of the United States is to maintain (in peacetime?) the possibility to arrange the country's latent potential to the level needed in wartime.

Every country is entitled to security, of course. But why is there a need in peacetime to swell national strength to a wartime level? Nazi Germany and militarist Japan did just that on the eve of World War II. As everyone knows, it was not for defense but preparation for aggression.

Army Secretary Brucker's statement before the Veterans of Foreign Wars was also out of step with professions of peace. The Army Secretary boasted that, thanks to America's military assistance, the United States and its allies are able to maintain land forces of some 5 million men, naval forces of 2,300 warships, and air forces numbering 29,000 planes. These vast military forces are scattered throughout the world, and many U.S. bases are situated at the very doors of the Soviet Union. If it is a question of protecting the United States, why build bases on the doorstep of the USSR? The Soviet Union does not attempt to establish bases in Africa or Latin America. Yet it is as concerned as any country about its security.

Air Force Secretary Sharp spoke openly about preparations for a future war. He did not even consider it necessary to pretend that America's large-scale military preparations are needed for defense. He said that

the duty of the U.S. Air Force is to maintain and develop its potential of offensive strategy. Note that--offensive, not defensive.

(It is known that?) generals and admirals always talk a lot about war, but neither Mr. Kennedy nor Mr. Nixon is a military man. One will become president in a few months. But both found war talk to their liking. Far from chiding the generals and admirals for such talk, they said the very same in addressing the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Even someone who would like to believe that America wants peace would change his mind after listening to the speakers at the convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars.

KENNEDY, NIXON TAKE ANTI-ARAB STAND

Moscow, Soviet Near Eastern Service in Arabic, Aug. 31, 1960, 1830 GMT--L

(Yevgeniy Primakov commentary)

(Excerpts) Each of the two nominees to the U.S. presidency has announced his general program and future U.S. policy on Israel and the Arab countries. The first to announce this was Kennedy, the Democratic Party nominee. He said:

The United States should make efforts to annul the blockade on Israeli ships wanting to use the Suez Canal. Following this statement, his Republican rival Nixon hurried to announce his anti-Arab attitude. In a speech delivered two days ago, Nixon promised that if elected president he would direct most of his interests to securing peace in the Middle East. Explaining this statement, Nixon said that he condemned the dispatch of Soviet arms to the UAR. Nevertheless, Nixon did not mention the provision of arms by the United States to Israel on a wide scale.

Furthermore, Nixon announced his objection to the economic boycott of Israel by the Arab countries. He claimed, among other things, that Middle East tension is due to the Palestinian refugees in the Arab countries. Nixon then demanded that Israeli ships be treated the same as other ships using the Suez Canal.

After these two statements by Nixon and Kennedy, we should not be surprised that the Arabs attach no importance to the results of the U.S. presidential election. This is because whatever the government, whether headed by a Democrat or a Republican, it will continue a policy of abetment of Israel and of hostility toward the Arabs.

Is this accidental, one might ask? Is it accidental that both Kennedy and Nixon deemed it their duty to deliver electoral speeches before the European Zionist organizations? Is the frank declaration to support

Israeli expansion (word indistinct) accidental? Is it accidental that such a declaration has become a new slogan in the U.S. campaign?

No, all these are not accidental nor coincidental. It is known that both nominees, Kennedy and Nixon, represent the bankers and monopolies in the United States. It is also known that most of the (influential?) people are Zionists and wear the five-pointed Zionist star. The policy followed by the Democratic and Republican parties in the Near East has always been, and still is, aimed at the so-called vacuum created in the Arab east as a result of the collapse of Western influence.

Israel has always supported U.S. attempts to fill this vacuum. Irrefutable reports are received every day exposing the hostile U.S. Arabic policy. We know that when the King of Saudi Arabia was on an official visit in New York the governor of New York refused to receive him. Later, it became clear that this insult from the governor of New York was instigated by Zionist elements. The U.S. State Department's attitude to this unseemly incident was merely that of an onlooker.

When the Arab countries protested the boycott of the ship Cleopatra in New York harbor, the U.S. Congress demanded that U.S. aid to the UAR be stopped. Furthermore, one's attention is drawn to the events of the last two or three months. On June 16 the first atom reactor was completed in Israel with U.S. aid. On Aug. 4, the director of the Bank of Israel, Tel Aviv, said that the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, a bank sponsored by the United States, had granted aid to Israel to the value of 28 million dollars and that this bank would, in the near future, grant Israel an additional 20-25 million dollars.

Dear listeners, you may remember the great efforts of the UAR to obtain a loan from the same bank to widen the Suez Canal. Israel obtained the loan without difficulty. On Aug. 10, it was announced that the so-called society for the investment of U.S. capital would invest 15 million dollars in Israel's economy during the first two years of the activities of this American organization, a large portion of which would be spent on the construction of the oil pipeline from Eilat to Haifa.

It is pointed out that this oil line is being deliberately laid with U.S. dollars to circumvent the Suez Canal. The object is not only to defeat the blockade of Israeli ships which do not pass through the canal, but to safeguard the rear of the United States in the event of U.S. aggression against the Arabs. It is known that the halt of petroleum deliveries to West Europe via pipelines and the Suez Canal during the Suez crisis resulted in a very severe deficit.

When reviewing this problem, I was surprised at the attitude of Cairo journalists who every now and then praise U.S. foreign policy. It is reasonable to assume that these Cairo journalists must be aware of these facts. Perhaps some of these journalists every now and then

praise U.S. policy because they are afraid that the genuine Soviet aid might increase Arab sympathy for the Soviet Union. Perhaps they are afraid that this genuine Soviet aid might finally convince the Arabs that the Soviet Union, led by the communists, is the only one of the four great powers to consistently follow a policy of friendship and brotherhood toward the Arabs.

Catering to Zionists

Moscow, Soviet Near Eastern Service in Arabic, Sept. 1, 1960, 1730 GMT--L

(Excerpt) (Passage omitted) On Aug. 27, Republican presidential candidate Richard Nixon spoke to a congress of American Zionists. He denounced the sending of Soviet arms to the UAR. But he said nothing about the big supplies of U.S. arms going to Israel. He said that if he were elected president he would make every effort to insure freedom of shipping through the Suez Canal. He added that so long as the Arabs continued their boycott, the Middle East would be a center of tension.

A day earlier, Democratic presidential candidate Kennedy spoke at a meeting of American Zionists. He said that if he were elected he would immediately take all the necessary measures to insure freedom of navigation. He also said that during the last half-century the wishes of the Zionists had always been carried out by American presidents of both parties. Kennedy added that friendship with Israel was no party matter, but a national American duty.

These are some of the events which explain the attitude of the USSR toward the Arabs during the month of August, and the attitude of the Arabs toward them. As is well known, of course, the events in August were not coincidental. They depict the policies of the various world powers toward the Arab world.

NOMINEES WHET ANTICOMMUNIST HYSTERIA

Moscow, Soviet Far Eastern Service in Russian, Sept. 1, 1960, 1715 GMT--L

(Note by Vladimir /Tetishev?/: "Under the Cover of Anticommunism"; read by announcer)

(Text) The U.S. presidential election campaign is in full swing. At the recent Republican and Democratic Party conventions candidates for the posts of president and vice president were nominated and the election platforms were approved. To the sound of marches and the beat of drums, speeches containing promises were heard from the platforms. They were calculated to win the trust of the electors, to sow the very brightest hopes for the future among them.

But has this purpose been achieved? Let us hear what the electors themselves have to say. The editors of the (Peshtigo?) TIMES, which is published in the state of Wisconsin, have received many letters from rank-and-file Americans. One of them, signed by Mr. and Mrs. (F.N.?) from (Wanlock?) says: "Some of us are alarmed and discouraged. To chose between Kennedy and Nixon is the same as jumping from the frying pan into the fire."

The question poses itself, then: What is the cause of this dissatisfaction and alarm on the part of American citizens? Let us turn to the election programs of the Republican and Democratic parties and the political careers of the presidential and vice presidential candidates. The ordinary people of America, weighed down by taxes and exhausted by the atmosphere of war psychosis, are striving for peace. However, the election programs of both parties, and especially the foreign policy sections, pursue entirely different aims.

They have for their basis the bankrupt positions-of-strength policy. The Republican Party sets as its main goal an increase in the military might of the United States. Eisenhower, speaking at the convention, noted as a great achievement the more-than-four-fold increase in military expenditures since he came to power. "The United States should put military considerations first," proclaims Nixon. Demands for increases in military allotments are also made by Kennedy, the Democratic candidate.

The Republican and Democratic parties are trying to justify the arms race by referring to some imaginary communist menace which it is alleged hangs over the United States. The press, radio, and television, all means of propaganda, have been directed against the electors. People with any realistic picture of reality are justified in asking: What has provoked this anticommunist hysteria? The peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union is common knowledge. The USSR Government has submitted to the United Nations concrete proposals on total and general disarmament. The Soviet Union has undertaken several unilateral actions in this direction. It has renounced military bases on the territory of other countries, considerably reduced its armed forces, and discontinued its tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons. This is known, too, by the U.S. ruling circles.

What is it, then, that makes them wave the flag of anticommunism? The real meaning of anticommunism will become understandable if we turn to history. The imperialists were shouting about the communist menace way back in 1917-20. Then it was required to justify attempts to destroy the first workers and peasants state, or, as Winston Churchill once put it figuratively, to stifle Bolshevism in the cradle.

It was to slogans of anticommunism that the German fascists prepared their attack on the Soviet Union. Now this bedraggled idea of a crusade against communism has been accepted as part of the armory of

the U.S. imperialists. Under the cover provided by it, aggression against the socialist camp is being prepared. This scheme has been frankly stated by Nixon, who has declared that he intends to pursue a strategy of victory over communism.

Ruling circles of the United States use slogans about the struggle against communism as a cover in their attempts to suppress each and every liberation movement. Remember Guatemala.

When the reactionary dictatorship was overthrown in this little Latin American republic and a bourgeois democratic government set about the implementation of progressive reforms which affected the interests of the U.S. monopolies, it was declared to be communist. Intervention was organized with U.S. aid, and reactionaries once more seized power in Guatemala. The reforms were abolished and arrests and murders followed. In this way, the U.S. Government made use of the anti-communist slogan to suppress the national liberation movement in Guatemala. Now this United States is vainly trying to repeat the process in Cuba.

Something must be said about yet another important role allotted to anticommunism by U.S. reactionary circles. With cries about the so-called "red menace," the suppliers of instruments of death try to justify the need for the constant increase in military production. At the insistence of Nelson Rockefeller, the Republican Party election platform was supplemented by points demanding an even greater intensification of the arms race, underground nuclear weapons tests, and so on.

U.S. ruling circles look upon anticommunism as a very important prerequisite for a successful political career by anyone. Take Nixon for example, that champion of the cold war and the arms race. In the elections of 1952, he ordered (leaflets?) to be distributed bearing the inscription "Vote for Nixon and You Will Strike a Blow Against Communism." He accused his opponent of red sympathies. Dick's ardor pleased the monopolists and they helped him become vice president. Now Nixon wants to get into the White House and threatens that he will put an end to communism.

As to whether Nixon will become president, that is a matter for Americans. With regard to his schemes concerning communism, one can say just one thing: There is no force on earth that can halt the development of communist ideas. Mankind's advance to the most just and progressive system, that of communism, is invincible.

NIXON, KENNEDY WOULD RETAIN ARMS DRIVE

Moscow, Soviet North American Service in English, Sept. 5, 1960,
2317 GMT--L

(Summary) Labor Day has brought messages to the U.S. people from Eisenhower, Nixon, and AFL/CIO Vice President Walter Reuther. It is difficult to agree with the latter in his belief that capitalism will prove its superiority to socialism in satisfying the needs of the people.

In the 15 years since the war, the U.S. economy has experienced three serious economic recessions. U.S. economists (foresee?) a possible new business slump in 1961. During May and June this year unemployment increased by nearly 1 million, and the steel, automobile, and building industries were working below capacity. There is chronic unemployment in 153 industrial centers.

In the USSR, on the other hand, the national economy has advanced steadily since the war, undisturbed by recessions, crises or depressions. During the present decade the USSR should be able to outstrip the United States in both overall and per capita production. By the end of the decade the USSR will have the world's highest living standard.

"Walter Reuther remarks in his Labor Day message that millions of Americans who today are the victims of unemployment ask why Americans cannot have full employment producing the things people need in peacetime, just as it had full employment manufacturing weapons of war. The answer to this question, Mr. Reuther asserts, will be given in November when the presidential elections are held.

"But what America's unemployed want, (few words indistinct), is to put a stop to the arms race so that the money now poured into armament can be reallocated for civilian needs. Union leader Reuther indicates with concrete facts how much the U.S. public would gain from an end to the arms drive. But there seems to be little hope of such an end. Both John Kennedy and Richard Nixon state in the election platforms that far from reducing the military budget they plan to increase it. In that case, what difference does it make who wins the election, Nixon or Kennedy?"

An arms race necessitates the unproductive expenditure of human energy and can only lead to another world war, bringing calamity to all nations. The main task today is to end the arms race. Humanity's labor should be geared to the single aim of creating an abundance of material and spiritual values for all.

BOTH U.S. CANDIDATES SUPPORT COLD WAR

Moscow, Soviet European Service in Albanian, Sept. 6, 1960, 1100 GMT--L

(Commentary: "The Elections in the United States and Peace")

(Text) The election campaign in the United States has reached its peak. The mandates of the candidates of the Republican and Democratic parties, which are the main political parties, have been adopted. Now the politicians have concentrated all their attention on the means of collecting as many votes as possible. In its outward aspect this electoral campaign does not differ from other electoral campaigns in America. Nevertheless, it deserves much greater attention than previous campaigns; it deserves to receive more attention by the social circles of the world.

The United States is the biggest state of the capitalist world and one which in many aspects determines the foreign policy of the capitalist world. In the years of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, the armaments race was greatly accelerated, the cold war strengthened, and the international situation aggravated. Precisely for this reason the social circles of the entire world are hoping that some change may result from the new elections and that the situation may improve. In the United States the president is elected every four years. So is the entire House of Representatives and a third of the Senate of the U.S. Congress. A number of other personalities are also elected. Conditions are created for the entry of new men into the state apparatus. Will the hopes of the peoples be realized?

The ruling circles of the United States who preach the policy of the cold war are doing everything in their power to prevent any change in favor of peace. This is clearly shown by the candidates for president and their electoral programs. Thus, for instance, the candidate of the Republican Party, Nixon, is a sworn enemy of the idea of peaceful coexistence. His program, which was dictated by billionaire Rockefeller, is a true hymn to the atomic bomb. The candidate for president adopted by the Democratic Party, John Kennedy, is still young and has had no time (to engage in?) any great political activity, but he does not mind speaking his mind, is the son of a billionaire from Boston, and demands wholeheartedly the continuation of the armaments race.

The fact itself that such candidates have been chosen for the top post in the United States has exerted an influence on the electoral campaign. The candidates are trying to give the impression that they differ from each other. Nixon, who is only a few years older than the 43-year-old Kennedy, has been presented to the voters as a model statesman.

Kennedy, paraphrasing the warlike slogans of Roosevelt's time, promises the American people a new political line. But this is only the outward appearance. In reality American voters will vote for twins indistin-

guishable from each other. Both candidates are for the continuation of the armaments race and of the cold war. Not only have the interests of foreign policy been sacrificed for the sake of the cold war, but also the interests of the internal policy of the United States.

The national economy is suffering from another decline. The country is being affected from inside by unemployment. In the background of the life of plenty of the minority the contrast of the poverty of the majority is becoming increasingly evident. Neither Nixon nor Kennedy, however, has said a word so far about how he intends to solve this problem. They called upon the Americans to further tighten their belts. Thus the U.S. electoral campaign shows clearly how the two political parties of the country have a single director. The director is big capital which makes profits from the armaments race and from the aggravation of the international situation. The simple American voter can vote only for one road. He is again faced with (words indistinct) without having the possibility to choose. The American people, as American Senator Fulbright said at the congress of the American Bar Association, feel unhappy in this situation. Fulbright particularly pointed out that the political life of the United States favoring the continuation of the cold war does not take into account the radical changes which have taken place in the world.

It is not surprising to read reports like that of the New York TIMES correspondent Sulzberger, who wrote that social circles in a number of western countries are disappointed by the candidacy of Kennedy and Nixon.

NIXON SHOWS IGNORANCE OF COMMUNISM

Moscow, Soviet Home Service, Sept. 8, 1960, 1800 GMT--L

(B.P. Stepanov commentary: "Richard Nixon in the Role of a Theoretician")

(Text) An old comic song tells how a cook, wishing to distinguish himself in front of his master, a rich landowner, decided to prepare an unusual tea. He showed zest beyond reason. In the water, together with tea and sweetmeats, he put pepper, flour, and a bit of parsley root; in fact, everything he found handy. Naturally, a disgusting dish resulted. Well, the servant was punished.

This song arouses only happy laughter, but a twin of this unlucky cook in the comic verses is found in the United States. With serious mien and importunate impudence, he is presenting his concoction to millions of Americans as a first-class dish.

As is known, the present U.S. president, Dwight Eisenhower, having shown more talent for golf than for state affairs, will soon leave his high post. The pretenders to this post have already been determined. Well,

one of them, the present vice president, Richard Nixon, speaking before various groups of Americans, is trying to impress his listeners with the thought that it is precisely he who knows the cherished road to everlasting blossoming of the country. To support his invariably anti-communist verbal statements, he decided to present to readers a series of printed works. The first of them has a pretentious title, "The Meaning of Communism to Americans."

The ASSOCIATED PRESS was in a hurry to publicize this 30-page pamphlet as a valuable document which allegedly gives a critical analysis of communism. At the same time, the New York TIMES expressed serious doubt of this. Its editorial says: "Though Mr. Nixon can be given a high mark for his intentions, he has not achieved one at all for the actual product, which written by him, or rather by his staff, is confusing in its incoherence."

In what does Nixon see the significance of communism for Americans? According to his usual explanation of this important and interesting question, he starts from the hackneyed fable about a "red menace." "The main problem facing the people of the United States and free peoples everywhere in the second half of the 20th century," he asserts, "is the threat to peace and freedom created by the bellicose aggressiveness of international communism."

The very first lines unmistakably exude a certain unfortunate smell. It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union long ago liquidated its military bases on the territories of other countries, that the military budget of the USSR and other socialist states is decreasing annually, that the Soviet Government unilaterally made a decision to stop atomic and thermonuclear weapon tests, that the entire socialist camp is consistently and steadily cutting the numerical strength of its armed forces, and that the Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed and insisted on total and universal disarmament. This has been done when the United States has ringed the Soviet Union and other socialist states with a dense network of rocket and air bases; when military expenditures, now taking more than half the national income of America, are constantly growing; when espionage and diversion have been declared to be the official policy of the state; when the U.S. Government systematically discourages all talks on strengthening peace and instigates plots and provocations against democracy and socialism; and when the President tells the youth of the United States that "it is much better to risk war and possible destruction than accept a peace which will definitely lead to the destruction of our ideas."

Not wanting to risk loud propagation of the aggressive intentions of his Wall Street bosses on the eve of an election and trying at the same time to please his influential masters, Nixon has set himself the task of explaining communism to the electors only as an idea--its economic philosophy, its philosophy of rights and policy, and its

philosophy of history. Naturally, it was not good times that made Nixon assume a task beyond his ability. The point is that he and his principal moneyed masters are themselves being convinced of the invincible strength of communist influence on the broad working masses throughout the world. The candidate to the high post in the White House is very alarmed by the fact that his countrymen do not understand sufficiently, in his opinion, why, despite many forecasts by bourgeois oracles, the Soviet Union has not only failed to perish in a period of over 40 years, but is in fact acquiring new strength in the victorious march at the head of the powerful camp toward the great goal indicated by Marxism-Leninism. How, according to the Vice President, has it managed to fulfill what it has already fulfilled in education and science, and why does it continue as before to be attractive in some of the world's problem areas to leaders who are trying to insure a better life for their peoples?

It is logical to expect that after (asking?) "why?" a deep analysis would follow, strengthened by facts, figures, and examples. But Nixon is not concerned with expressing thoughts, but in finding out and (pointing out?) probable shortcomings of the Marxists. He writes: "One of the most striking gaps in communist theory is that it gives no clear picture at all of how the communist economy will be organized. The works by the great founders of communism," he asserts, "have literally nothing to say about it." Well, one must really laugh at the vain attempts of this newly fledged theoretician!

It is clear that Nixon has taken up something beyond him. "He plays the pipe," a Russian proverb says, "but has no ear for music." If the facts are against him, then the U.S. Vice President apparently thinks that it is the worse for the facts. Even the laws of logic are not written for him. In his pamphlet he admits, it is true, though unwillingly, that it has now become possible to identify communism with a country which distinguished itself with the tallest educational establishments and with the heaviest space satellites.

At the same time he declares without embarrassment: "In rocketry and space research we have risen to the occasion and have preserved the leading position which we have achieved." This was said on the very day when the whole world, including the American people, acclaimed the Soviet spaceship-satellite which was blazing a path for man to other planets.

Moreover, Nixon asserts that there is a complete lack of prospects for the development of the Soviet economy. In his opinion, the cause of this lies in centralized planning which completely denies the principles of private enterprise and markets. He is not embarrassed at all that in the past 40 years and over the average annual growth rate of production in the USSR exceeded 11 percent, while in the United States it did not reach even 4 percent.

In his strange assertions, to put it mildly, he radically contradicts many competent American specialists. For instance, the American economist Berliner declares unequivocally: "I regard it as proved that the socialist economy is sufficiently effective." Even the director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles, speaking to one of the congressional committees in October 1959 warned: "We must honestly admit the very sobering results of the Soviet economic program and the amazing successes achieved by it in the past decade."

Nixon is bitterly grieved by the fact that the managers of Soviet enterprises allegedly do not have sufficient freedom of action. Well, if they acted like capitalist employers, then the Soviet economy would have "worthy captains." There is no need to discuss in detail this obvious rubbish. Let us only quote the expert of the united economic commission of the U.S. Congress (Granite?), who declared: "Today the Soviet enterprise manager embodies solid training, theoretical conviction, and authority which enables him to use his training creatively."

Apparently feeling his weakness in his struggle with Marxist economic science, Nixon is in a hurry to jump over to ideology, which, since he is a lawyer, is closer to him. "As for the communist world outlook, rights, and political questions," he proclaims, "we can assert that there is hardly such a world outlook."

What is the basis of his assertions? As before, it is ravings from the arsenal of bourgeois charlatans of science whose clique he is trying so hard to join. He, you see, is indignant because Marxism refutes the eternal and immutable nature of moral and (word indistinct) truths of all social formations; that under communism such institutes as parliaments, courts, armies, and prisons must disappear. The Soviet people are not troubled about this. They have already started transferring a whole series of state functions to the public, and the results have been marvelous.

Nixon's theoretical labors are particularly striking in their combination of amazing brazenness with vivid imagination. For instance, he asserts seriously that communist philosophy denies the existence of any moral truths. This absurd (thesis?) is often presented. The trial of the American spy Powers opened the eyes of even those who were formerly misled to the beastly morality of imperialism.

Without blushing, Nixon tries to convince his compatriots that the Soviet system completely excludes man's basic necessity, a true feeling of freedom. In Russian, this maneuver is called laying the blame at somebody else's door. What freedom is Nixon talking about? Is it the one which Negroes have in the United States, or the one which they present to the population of the countries oppressed by foreign capital? Is it the freedom under which the American workers look unsuccessfully for work for years, and the freedom of capitalists to reap profits from ordinary people?

The American sociologist (Lloyd Hunter?), whom it is difficult to suspect of communist sympathies, frankly states: "None of our national leaders considers that such questions of domestic policy as the raising of the people's wellbeing, the liquidation of (slums?), the safeguarding of rights of national minorities, and such are important." This is clearly proved by facts.

And even more, with one stroke of the pen, Nixon strikes off Marxist-Leninist teachings. "According to preliminary figures," the (would be?) theoretician states haughtily, "the mistaken predications of communism amount to about 100 percent." According to him, the victorious march of socialism and communism in the Soviet Union and countries of the socialist camp is not proof but rather negation of the truths of Marxism-Leninism.

Well, Nixon's arithmetic is not very complicated. One needs only use minus instead of plus signs and the result is there. Having just managed to mention the Marxist theory of impoverishment, he declares it to be wrong. He even ignores the fact, which is even confirmed by official American statistics, that the richest top crust in the United States, amounting to only 1 percent of the population, controls 59 percent of the national wealth of the country, whereas 87 percent of the American working people share only 8 percent of the national wealth.

The present rapid disintegration of the world colonial system is also presented by Nixon as a refutation of Marxism-Leninism. "The Marxists stressed that under capitalism colonialism would grow, but in fact the very opposite is taking place." Well, what can you say to such a critic? One could recommend that he acquaint himself with Lenin's work (title indistinct), which clearly states that the countries of the East will soon cease to be reserves for imperialism because they have started development that must lead to a crisis in worldwide capitalism. No scientific arguments have been written for Nixon in (word indistinct).

In the 30 pages of Nixon's work, which has been brazenly called a "memorandum," there are many of these refutations of Marxism. They have been prepared according to one recipe: unforgiveable lies and dirty slander, and a generous dose of extreme ignorance. All this is noticeable in the bestial hatred of communism.

The New York POST observer William Shannon, having acquainted himself with Nixon's statement, remarked: "If this is the maximum that the Vice President can write about communism--and on this question he regards himself a specialist--then I fear what he may write about agriculture, finance, and other questions on which he is less informed."

Indeed, one must assume that similar thoughts worry many Americans. Marxism-Leninism has become a banner of our epoch. Even now millions of people in the whole world are gathering under it. The head of the Soviet Government, N.S. Khrushchev, said: "The sun rising to the zenith sends its rays everywhere. In the same way communism, whose rise started in the Soviet country, is now rising toward the zenith. The shroud is falling away and the blind will regain their sight and will see what is white and black. All the peoples will be convinced that there is only one road to progress for mankind and a better life. It is the road to communism."

Our everyday life eloquently proves the whole truth of these words. No Nixons will be able to slow down the natural development of history, nor ever soil the eternally vital and victorious Marxist-Leninist teaching. The mighty march of communism that it predicted is invincible.

U.S. ELECTION NO TRIUMPH OF DEMOCRACY

Moscow, Soviet European Service in Greek, Sept. 14, 1960, 1630 GMT--L

(Shakhov commentary)

(Text) Dear listeners: The election campaign in the United States is at its zenith. Democratic candidate John Kennedy makes speeches nearly every day and promises everyone everything. His Republican opponent Richard Nixon is some way behind, as they say in athletics. After his illness he had to rest a little. This week, Nixon has been trying to fill in the gaps, and he plans to start a 9,000-mile tour.

The elections will be held in seven weeks but the struggle has already taken on a severe character. The New York TIMES states that at the beginning of November, the American people will decide the fate of the opponents of the two parties and will give one of them the right to live in the White House for four years and that irrespective of the election results, U.S. democracy will triumph.

Other newspapers write about this notorious U.S. democracy. They tirelessly praise it and the two candidates. It is not difficult for us to guess why they praise this democracy so much. The electoral system created by the moneybags in substance deprives U.S. citizens of the right to elect. When he goes to the polls, the American cannot express his will, he can only support one of the candidates chosen by the true masters of America, the big financiers. It is not by chance that the candidate chosen by the Democrats has a fortune amounting to millions of dollars and Nixon, the Republican candidate, has the support of the Morgan house and the financiers of California. Can one without any irony call these people true representatives of the American people? In a letter to the WORLD TELEGRAM AND SUN a reader wrote: "Are politics merely the prerogative of the rich? Why is it that someone who has not much money can never run for president?"

However, U.S. citizens do not only lack the right to choose. Tens of millions do not have the right to vote. U.S. newspapers have often asserted a well-known fact without going into explanations: Although there are over 100 million people of voting age in the country, on an average only between 50 and 60 million vote. Why is this? The 40 to 50 million Americans who are thus lost, are, in effect, unable to vote. Many difficulties and hindrances have been placed in their way. No unified electoral system exists in the country. The courts in each state can use their own judgement as to whether to allow people to vote.

Altogether, in the United States there are more than 100 restrictions on the right to vote. Here are some of these; First, 7 million young people between the ages of 18 and 21 are not permitted to vote. Second, the condition of permanent residence handicaps the land workers and unemployed; 6 million Americans are victims of this restriction.

Third, any American may be restricted from participating in elections on the grounds of illiteracy. It is sufficient to quote the following example. During the elections of 1956 the Negress (Bessie Abbots?), a university student, was not permitted to vote because she was unable to quote part of Article II of the U.S. Constitution, an article which is several pages long. About 8 million American Negroes have been deprived of the rights of an American citizen on grounds of illiteracy. In Mississippi for instance 50 percent of the population of 2 million are Negroes but only 300,000 of these have the right to participate in elections. In Alabama, there are (??) times more Negroes than whites, but there are 10 times fewer voting Negroes. These and many other restrictions have deprived tens of millions of Americans of the right to vote.

Quite apart from this, every time there are elections, about 10 million Americans refuse to vote. "We are unable to vote either for the Democrats or for the Republicans," a group of citizens from the state of Wisconsin wrote to the newspaper CAPITAL TIMES. "There is no choice for us. To choose between Nixon and Kennedy is to choose between two fires." This is the secret of the 40 million Americans who are not participating in the U.S. presidential elections. This is the reply to the question why Eisenhower came to the White House twice with a total support of a mere third of the electorate.

No, democracy will not triumph in the forthcoming presidential elections in the United States. Those who triumph will be Dupont, Morgan, Mellon, and the others who are the true masters of America. Irrespective of who becomes president to bet on either horse is a hollow gesture.

H U N G A R Y

COMMUNISM'S VIRTUES CANNOT BE DENIED

Budapest, in English to North America, Sept. 1, 1960, 0001 GMT--E

(Istvan Csaki commentary)

(Text) How the U.S. Communist Party will observe its 41st anniversary this week, I do not know. But, whether the party will mark the occasion with festivities or not, talk about communism at present is not lacking in the United States. It seems that this will again be one of the major issues in the country's election campaign. The candidates of both parties have declared their readiness to accept the challenge of communism. Mr. Nixon has suddenly decided that more should be said about the American Revolution and less about the menace of the communist revolution, and Mr. Kennedy spares no words in talking about the dignity of man.

I have no real way of knowing what the average American voter thinks of all this, and from so far away I would not dare venture a guess. Most thinking people on this side of the ocean, and I do not mean only in the socialist countries, understand that there is very little general knowledge in the United States about communism and what it stands for. That is not surprising when one takes into consideration that U.S. officials have allowed the Communist Party little opportunity to make its aims known.

In the 1930's, the American Communist Party won considerable popularity and prestige in the fight for unemployment relief which finally resulted in the establishment of social security in the United States. Communists contributed much toward the organization of the unskilled workers and the formation of the powerful CIO, and for a long time the communists were practically the sole supporters of the Negro people's fight for equality. It seems hardly necessary to point out that these activities account for the persecution of the Communist Party by U.S. officials, just as it was the fear of the effect of the Russian Revolution in 1917 that brought about the mass arrests of American communists and deportation of thousands of foreign-born in the early 1920's.

With some notable exceptions, the past 40 years have been marked by a sustained, frenzied attack on communism in general and most specifically on the Soviet Union, the first socialist country.

As I said, I have no way of knowing what the American voter's reaction to all this is, but almost inevitably one wonders why, if the U.S. Government and its industrial and political leaders are so confident that their way of life is superior, why the frenzy and why the fear? Why not put the words of the Democratic and Republican parties into

practice by really accepting the challenge of communism, not by leading a campaign of slander and cold war and military preparations, but by competing with the socialist world in seeing who can bring greater material and spiritual benefit to man? Man will then decide for himself.

In the short period of 30 years, one-third of the world's population has decided in favor of socialism. Even the most rabid anticommunists in the United States would not say that the 600 million people in China were forced by a handful of leaders into accepting socialism, any more than were the Russian people. They do say that the low standards of life in these two countries offered little alternative. That the standard of life was very low is beyond argument, but at the same time it is also true that it was feudalism and capitalism which forced that low standard upon the people of those countries, and it is socialism that has made the Soviet Union practically the leading world power, and is achieving wonders in China.

These countries present a worthy challenge. The acceptance of this challenge to competition in the economic, scientific, and cultural fields would be most welcome and a beneficial development.

O T H E R C O U N T R I E S

United Arab Republic

ARAB UNITY BLOW TO NIXON, KENNEDY AIMS

Cairo, Voice of the Arabs in Arabic to the Arab World, Aug. 29, 1960,
1630 GMT--M

(Adil al-Qadi commentary: "Nixon and Kennedy Support Israel")

(Text) Amid a storm of cheers and applause the snake charmer, with great skill, coaxed from his basket with the tunes of his pipe two snakes twisting left and right. This scene was part of a long play written by world Zionism and shown at the annual conference of the American Zionist organization.

The imperialist-Zionist festival began with the snake John Kennedy, who began his address to the conferees at the American Zionist organization by describing Israel, the snake charmer, as the child of hope, the land of the brave, and the most free and democratic country in the world. The snake John Kennedy went on to dance to the tunes of the pipe and say that the first item on the list of Zionist demands he would try to realize if he assumed power was the implementation of the tripartite declaration, which seeks first and foremost to safeguard Israel in the area and to preserve its security.

We need not reply to those, such as Kennedy, who take orders from Zionism. But we wish to whisper in the ears of this imperialist-Zionist lackey and ask: Where is the democracy of Israel, the state which was founded on racial discrimination? A look at the Talmud will show the inclinations of those Jewish priests and rabbis who diverted from the Bible and who advocated contempt and humiliation of all the world peoples, so much so that they even described non-Jews as defiled peoples.

Where was this democracy of which Kennedy is speaking when Israel assaulted women, children, and the aged, and when they ripped open the bellies of pregnant women at Dayr Yasin, Qibyah, Nahhalin, Kan Yunus, and hundreds of struggling Palestinian villages?

As to the tripartite declaration which Kennedy claimed he would implement, the truth is that Kennedy is not aware of the development of affairs. This tripartite declaration of which this Zionist lackey is talking died when France, Britain, and Israel plotted and undertook aggression against Egypt in 1956.

Richard Nixon announced his stand after John Kennedy. He asserted that his aim is to reestablish peace in the Middle East, end the Arab-Israeli dispute, exert continued efforts to secure freedom of navigation for Israel in the Suez Canal, increase support for Israel, and supply it with aid to enable it to develop its life--this in addition to many other promises Nixon made at the annual American Zionist conference in the beggar's list he prepared to woo the Zionist forces which dominate the progress of American elections.

If Nixon, and Kennedy before him, prepared the begging lists to win the largest possible number of votes to place one or the other in the president's chair, then for the sake of truth we say they did not commit any crime--unless their ignorance of the truth about the Arab stand today is considered a crime.

Neither Nixon nor Kennedy has committed any crime other than that each has deceived himself more than he deceived the conferees at the annual American Zionist organization conference.

Nixon may wish to grant Israel peace in the Middle East and to impose peace between it and the Arabs, but neither Nixon, nor Kennedy, nor any other can achieve this. For where is the Arab who can sit at one table with Israel, which has shed the blood of his forefathers and children, and has slain his women and made his children homeless?

If Nixon wants to safeguard Israel and establish peace in our Arab area, then what does he say about the 1 million Arabs living in tents and scattered without land or homeland? What does he say about the 1 million Arabs suffering from hunger and deprivation? What does Nixon say when 1 million Arabs are living in the open, in danger of their lives?

If Nixon wants Israel to pass through the Suez Canal, then let him take a lesson from the experiences of Zionism and imperialism with the UAR. Let him take a lesson from the plots of Inge Toft, Astypales, Cleopatra, the starvation war, and the threat of aggression. For the sake of the Palestinian Arabs' rights and their existence the UAR will never allow Israel to pass through the canal.

Nixon and Kennedy, Britain which concludes suspicious deals and which supplies Israel with arms, and France which paves the way for Israel's penetration into Africa--all these will not succeed in prolonging the life of the illegal child Israel.

No longer can imperialism maintain its influence by force. No longer can imperialism force the peoples to accept it under any guise. This was proved in the Congo, and was proved earlier in Japan, Korea, Turkey, Laos, and everywhere.

Did Nixon and Kennedy learn the lesson? It seems that Zionism has blinded the eyes of both to the simplest fact--that the peoples' destinies are no longer determined in Washington, London, or Paris. The peoples' destinies today are determined by the will of the peoples themselves and within their homelands.

Today the Arab people have approved the establishment of the Palestinian entity (kiyan falastin) as a united people, which Israel fears and which imperialism and the imperialists work to prevent.

The Arab states have asserted the rights of the Palestinian people. Neither Nixon nor Kennedy was consulted. The Arab states have decided to establish the Palestinian entity and to form a Palestinian army to add to the nucleus which the Arab people reviewed during the July 23rd celebrations. The Arab states unanimously made this decision at the Arab foreign ministers conference in Shaturah. Unanimity was manifested to counter the growing plots hatched by world Zionism and those supporting it with a view to liquidating the Palestine question.

The resolutions of the Arab conference have come to assert Arab unity for the sake of Palestine, to assert the revival of Palestine, and to safeguard for the Palestinian Arabs their usurped rights. Arab unity has come to assert the unity of the Arab people in the struggle for Palestine. It also came as a blow to Zionism, as a blow to imperialism and to imperialists such as John Kennedy and Richard Nixon.

TWO PARTIES VIE TO WIN JEWISH VOTES

Cairo, Egyptian Home Service, Aug. 30, 1960, 0500 GMT--M

(From the press review)

(Excerpts) On the promises made by Nixon and Kennedy at the American Zionist organization conference in New York, AL-AKHBAR writes: "The two American parties are outdoing each other in pleasing Zionism to get Jewish votes. Both Nixon and Kennedy have forgotten possibly that the loyalty of the citizen of any country is first and last to his own country. The encouragement of American citizens to practice double loyalty is harmful to the interests of the United States. However, this is a matter concerning the Americans only.

"We would like to ask the two respectable gentlemen, Kennedy and Nixon, how they plan to fulfill their promises to the Jewish voters, and whether their promises fall within the jurisdiction of their duties if one of them should become the president of the United States.

"Let us consider the essence of their promises. Both have undertaken to conclude a peace between the Arabs and Israel and to end the ban on the passage of Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal. Peace between

the Arabs and Israel requires the consent of the two sides. If Israel is America's protege and will then submit to its wish, are the Arabs the same? The two respectable gentlemen know, or they should know, that the Arab states are independent states which obtain inspiration from no one and that these states have already declared their boycott of Israel and their refusal to conclude any peace with it.

"This is also the case with the question of passage of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal. The canal belongs to the UAR. It runs through its territory and it alone has the right to control it. With regard to the system of navigation in it, the UAR is carrying out its commitments defined by international agreements, particularly the 1888 agreement, which entitled it to ban the passage of Israel's ships due to the presence of a state of war between the two countries.

"What authority does the president of the United States--whether Nixon, Kennedy, or any other--have over a canal which does not belong to him, and whose owner is applying an international agreement which clearly permits a ban on the passage of ships belonging to any belligerent state?

"The fact remains that the two respectable gentlemen have transcended every right and rule. The American voters--we too--will see how either of the two candidates will fulfill his promises."

Damascus Views

Damascus, in Arabic to Syria and the Near East, Aug. 30, 1960, 0515 GMT--M

(Excerpts) Commenting on the competition between Nixon and Kennedy to own Zionism and on the attempt of each of them to beg for the votes of the Jews in the forthcoming elections at the expense of the Arabs and their interests, AN-NASR says today: "John Kennedy is free to bow before Israel and free to shed the tears of imposture before the phantom of the wandering Jew. However, he is not free to sell our (future?), to trade with our fate, or to make us yield to Israel's ambitions. If Kennedy is able to conclude a biased deal at our expense, he will be incapable of implementing it, even if he reaches the White House.

"We wish the members of the American parties had reviewed the tragedies which have resulted from such promises and deals and the horrible errors which have made the United States hated by independent peoples. What we hear and see now is proof that these people lose their heads at election time.

"No, Kennedy; no, Nixon. The Arab people, who possess will and determination, will under no circumstances agree for the heads of the Arabs to meet with the vagabond intruder Ben Gurion, will not agree to allow Israel to pass through the Suez Canal, and will not accept the settlement of the Palestinians as a result of the liquidation of Palestine."

In conclusion, AN-NASR says: "Such signs show that the level of the American presidency is reaching a regrettable state of deterioration. Such deterioration will only be at the expense of the American people in whose name such comedies are being played."

Iraqi Comment

KENNEDY, NIXON ACCUSED OF MEDDLING

Baghdad, Iraqi Home Service, Sept. 4, 1960, 1900 GMT--M

(Political commentary)

(Text) We do not know how American politicians allow themselves to involve others' affairs in their election campaigns as if these were purely their own internal affairs. The two American presidential candidates have spoken about the Palestine question using the same logic and the same views despite the fact that they represent two different parties. They spoke about this question as though Palestine was a part of America, like Alaska or New York.

This, however, is not surprising if we take into consideration that Israel is an aggressive base not only for the American imperialists but also for the entire world imperialism. This fake state was created in an aggressive manner to be a thorn in the heart of the Arab countries, to prevent stability from prevailing in them, and to threaten their security. Facts clearly indicate that Israel was established primarily by American dollars, with support by other states each serving its own interests which, base as they were, became fully evident in the sinful tripartite aggression on Egypt in 1956.

The statements of the two American presidential candidates were not only meant to please the Jews of the United States and to buy the votes and influence of the Jewish bankers in New York, but also to strengthen Israel, the imperialist center in the Middle East so that it might be used as a tool for exerting pressure on the Arab states. We here recall that this unsuccessful and exposed method was used during the Syrian crisis of 1957, when Israel was used to exert pressure on Syria in cooperation with Turkey, which was then ruled by Adnan Menderes.

The two presidential candidates have claimed that they would work to open the Suez Canal for Israeli ships. It is clear that this is a clumsy interference in the affairs of the Arab countries and a flagrant attachment to the interests of a state with which all the Arab states still consider themselves in a state of war. The Suez Canal is not a part of the United States, so that Nixon or Kennedy can say what ships should or should not pass through it. This canal belongs to the Egyptian people in the first place and to all the Arabs in the second place. It is situated in a sovereign state. Neither Nixon, Kennedy, nor any other individual in the world can impose on a sovereign state matters which concern the essence of its sovereignty and independence.

We do not expect those who support Israel, justified its aggression against the Arab people, and supported its usurpation of a cherished part of the Arab world to behave otherwise, because they recognize the illegality and injustice of their stand and stick to it with premeditation and ill intention. However, we thought that their slighting of the destinies of others would not go so far as to interfere so flagrantly in the affairs of others, thus showing an erroneous estimate of the situation.

We warn the American politicians and others that they should weigh their statements and their political attitudes, especially with regard to Arab questions. The Arabs now are not the Arabs of 1948. Now they are determined to snatch their usurped rights in Palestine and to stifle the Israeli aggression. In this they have now begun to take steps not lacking determination, sincerity, or sacrifice. The people of Palestine are now on the right path toward the recovery of their homeland complete and undiminished, as well as their freedom and independence.

The nucleus of the Palestinian liberation army has emerged in our republic. The Arab people of Palestine are now on a road different from that followed by the traitorous and renegade Arab rulers. As imperialist agents speak about expanding the area of Israel and achieving new concessions for it at the expense of the Arabs, the Arabs on their part now speak about something else--the destruction of this aggressive and artificial creature called Israel. They are confident that right and justice are on their side and that history is taking their road. The inevitable end of Israel and its masters and servants is undoubtedly coming.

Lebanon

NIXON SHARES WORLD CONCERN FOR PEACE

Beirut, in Arabic to Lebanon and the Near East, Sept. 12, 1960,
1800 GMT--M

(Commentary)

(Text) The statement of Nixon, U.S. vice president and Republican presidential candidate, about Khrushchev's expected visit to the United States was calm and implied a desire to pacify world tension. Nixon announced that President Eisenhower might meet with Khrushchev if the Soviet leader was willing to discuss the possibility of concluding an agreement on the banning of nuclear tests. He also said that he favored the continuation of the current negotiations with the Soviet Union and Britain in connection with the banning of nuclear tests. He added that there was still hope that the test-ban negotiations might succeed.

Although these statements of Nixon revealed nothing significantly new in the American attitude, they, however, have special importance coming from a presidential candidate during the election battle.

Violent political stands by American presidential candidates--especially with regard to the Soviet Union--have always been favored, particularly at elections time. Nixon's attitude, expressing the official opinion of the American Government as well as his own opinion as a candidate, was quite remote from such violence. This indicates the general wish of the world states to get rid of the existing tense atmosphere quickly, and their awareness of the importance of the opportunity for peace when the United Nations convenes.

Nixon was not the only important politician who recently spoke with this calm tone. More than one big politician in more than one state has done so before him. These distinguished politicians belonged to the various eastern, western, and neutral camps in the world. This strengthens the hope of the optimistic observers that the forthcoming United Nations session and the concurrent direct contacts between the main politicians representing their countries at the United Nations will be a golden time to work for peace.

Greece

REFUELED USSR PLANES CARRIED ONLY FOOD

Athens, Greek Home Service, Sept. 6, 1960, 2015 GMT--M

(Excerpt) The ATHENS NEWS AGENCY reported the following, in relation to the statements by the American Democratic presidential candidate, Mr. Kennedy, on the refueling of Soviet aircraft in Athens during their flight to the Congo.

Certain reports published abroad in reference to the passage over Greece of Soviet aircraft destined for the Congo were commented upon by authoritative diplomatic commentators as follows: It is said that certain circles abroad expressed opinions and made criticisms without knowing the true facts. The true facts are these. The Soviet Government asked permission to fly over Greece, land at Hellinikon Airfield, and refuel 10 Soviet aircraft transporting food to Leopoldville destined for the Congolese Government.

The Greek Government granted permission on the condition that the Greek authorities should exercise the right to search the planes and their cargo. The Soviet Government accepted this condition. The flight took place and the search proved that the above-mentioned Soviet aircraft were in fact transporting foodstuffs.

Kenya

KENNEDY LIFT CALLED POLITICAL SWINDLE

London, REUTERS, Radioteletype in English to Authorized Recipients, Sept. 12, 1960, 2011 GMT--E

(Text) Nairobi--A Kenya political leader today called the airlift of 280 East African students to the United States a "political swindle" as the third planeload headed toward America. The airlift, aided by a 100,000-dollar gift from the Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. Foundation, has sparked a bitter row between two Kenya political parties--the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU) and the Kenya African National Union (KANU).

KADU Deputy Leader Masinde Muliro said his party intended to send a delegation to the United States to see that further American gifts to Kenya students are administered by "people genuinely interested in Kenya's development and not by politicians who want votes."

Muliro said that while Africans appreciated American generosity they were "disturbed and embittered" by arrangements currently being made for students. He charged preference was shown to two major tribes and many of the U.S.-bound students had failed preliminary and common entrance examinations, while some of those left behind held first-class certificates. Muliro suggested that in the future, selection of students should be made by Americans.

The donation from the family foundation of presidential candidate John Kennedy was arranged by KANU leader Tom Mboya, who turned down a similar offer by the U.S. State Department. Mboya said all Indians who applied for the airlift were accepted. Europeans could also have gone, he added, but none applied.

Cuba

KENNEDY, NIXON VIE IN SLANDERING CASTRO

Havana, Radio Mambi, in Spanish to Cuba, Sept. 5, 1960, 2330 GMT--F

(Summary) Kennedy and Nixon, the two wheels of the same chariot and the two faces of the same coin, lose no opportunity in attacking Cuba, its revolution, and its leader Fidel Castro. In doing so, they prove that they care nothing about the opinion of the people but that they do care about praising and serving the imperialists and their Wall Street interests.

The subject of the Cuban revolution and the subject of Fidel Castro have been used for months and are still being used by both Nixon and Kennedy, who seem to have begun a marathon to see which of the two says more stupidities about Fidel and our revolution. And all of this is part of their presidential campaign, an attempt to please the masters of the "Yankee" empire. The imperialists care very little which of the two men becomes president, but the two do care and they want to find out which of them is going to be chosen.

Kennedy's Portland Speech

Havana, Radio Centro, in Spanish to Cuba, Sept. 3, 1960, 1130 GMT--E

(Text) In Portland, Maine, Senator John F. Kennedy, the Democratic candidate for the presidency, said that Cuban Prime Minister Dr. Fidel Castro ought to be condemned by the rest of the nations of Latin America as a source of the greatest danger. Kennedy made his most recent anti-Cuba statements in a televised speech. In his speech he also said that the main task of the next administration will be to keep the Cuban revolution from spreading. He expressed the already well-known accusation of communism against the Cuban revolution, pointing out that the threat of communist infiltration must not endanger the rest of Latin America.

In answer to a question, Kennedy said that he had to criticize the manner in which the Eisenhower Administration had handled the Castro regime and that of Batista. He concluded his statement by saying that it appeared the United States would continue to have considerable difficulty with Cuba in the future.

Dominican Republic

NIXON CONTRIBUTED TO CASTRO VICTORY

Ciudad Trujillo, Radio Caribe in Spanish to the World, Sept. 14, 1960, 1000 GMT--P

(Text) The simple criterion used by North American leaders when they look at Latin America and its problems causes surprise. They are self-styled statesmen who presume they have the right, on the basis of their own merits, to assume the highest office as chief of state. An example of this simplicity and presumption is Richard M. Nixon, vice president and Republican Party candidate for the presidency of the United States in the forthcoming elections.

In his first televised election speech, Nixon affirmed that Fidel Castro would not have seized power in Cuba if the plan recently approved by the U.S. Congress had been implemented five years ago.

Nixon referred to the 500 million dollars which the United States used as a suborning springboard in the sixth and seventh San Jose conferences, and then as booty (in the meeting) which just closed in Bogota.

Such an outlandish statement warrants meditation. It must be ascertained just what connection there is between the offer of a few or many millions of American dollars and Fidel Castro's armed rebellion, the events in the Sierra Maestra and, lastly, the flight of Batista and the consequent assumption of power by the bearded Cuban leader?

The political drama through which Cuba passed and is currently passing it totally alien to Nixon, and all the Yankee Nixons view it with aberrated vision. Such persons are accustomed to view our America in the light of gleaming gold, or through a sharply mercantilistic criterion. For them, everything is arranged or disarranged according to how the pocket containing their dollars--the heaps of dollars which they believe they can use to buy up consciences or raw materials--opens and closes.

When Fidel Castro defied Batista's military might, disembarked from the yacht "Gramma," and entrenched himself in Cuba's Sierra Maestra much money was in circulation. Industry, primarily construction, was on the uprise; new enterprises set up by men of initiative mushroomed. All this was based on economic and political stability.

The fact that the public administration was corrupt at its roots and that theft and embezzlement of state money had reached higher peaks than in the democratic, but not less corrupt, governments of Grau San Martin and Prio Socarras, was not an indication of national impoverishment, but rather that greater revenues produced more juicy profits at the top. Under such a flourishing economic and political climate, what could have been the effect of the crumbs which Cuba would have obtained from the distribution of 500 millions in the aid plan financed by the United States? Absolutely none.

The Castrista revolution is a Cuban socio-economic, and political phenomenon rooted in depths which the metallic-blurred eyes of Richard Nixon and all the other Nixons do not know how to plumb or comprehend. For they are businessmen, accustomed to evaluating men, things, and events on the basis of elementary arithmetic. They add, divide, and get the percentages.

But these are procedures too simple to be used by one who self-styles himself an expert on Latin American affairs and in addition aspires to the presidency of the United States. For what it's worth, since no one knows whether he will win the election, we should remind him that he himself, Richard M. Nixon, efficiently cooperated in Batista's

downfall and Fidel Castro's subsequent triumph. It was when he returned to the United States from his eventful Latin American trip that, instead of patiently reacting against the attacks of leftist and pro-communist mobs committed on him and his wife in Caracas, Nixon wiped the spit off his lapel, smiled at these same leftists, and vented his ire against governments which he called rightist dictatorships.

At that moment Nixon simultaneously sentenced Batista and helped Castro rise to power. That is the man who presumes himself an expert in Latin American affairs, with all the trappings of a statesman.